5/28/70

Dear Dick,

As I went out to mail letters to you, I received your 5/22 to me, and will respond briefly.

On Sprague, I agree that we shouldn't get involved in discussion on this. I still feel it is potentially "dangerous" in that it is something which can be seized by those who oppose us as an example of our carelessness, ignorance, and exaggeration--etc.

I think I may be conveying to both you and Harold the wrong idea about my beliefs by my flagrant use of "conservative" and "liberal." I am neither, and wish to be labeled as neither. To me, there is no "right" or "left": There is right or wrong. I subscribe to what I believe is right, whether it may be arbitrarily classified with a particular political stand or not.

Thanks for the comments on 00-buckshot. These shootings are a perfect case where an autopsy clarified things, where prior to the autopsy a state existed similar to what happened with assass. Good analogy, I think.

Don't send Penn Jones' editorial. Skolnick sent it to me along with his other stuff, including an article that said he would be subpoenoing Lyndon Johnson.

Have heard nothing of the book you describe by Albert Newman. It sounds like something which would benefit all if its existance were not known, though.

Now that I think about it, I would like to borrow Lifton's "Documentary Appendium" with the Exec. Sessions in it. Send it when you get a chance, OK? Unless it is extremely heavy and will cost a lot to mail. If so, I might buy one for myself already.

Stay well,

cc Harold

NOTE: This is a proposed letter to Rhoads which bears on the slides recently made for me at Archives. I think it may bear on Harold's efforts to get the spectro analysis and may have other significances, so I am sending it to Harold and Dick for comment and possible revision before I send it to Rhoads.

Dear Dr. Rhoads:

I address this letter to you because I feel it concerns a matter which should be brought to your attention.

I have corresponded with a member of your staff, Mr. Mark G. Eckhoff, on matters germane to the records of the Warren Commission. Just recently, XXXXXXXX the Archives prepared for me an order of color slides made of certain ballistics specimens in the Commission's evidence. Please allow me to express my deepest gratitude to your staff for having followed the details of my request so closely.

There are, however, certain things about the slides which puzzle me and about which I seek your explanation. In particular, one slide does not appear at all consistant with the original exhibits introduced into evidence at the Commission hearings. The following anomalies are apparent:XX

(1) CE 840 allegedly consists of 3 fragments of metal removed from the carpet beneath the left jump seat in the Presidential limousine during the early morning hours of November 23, 1963. FBI agent Robert Frazier testified to this fact before the Commission (see volume 5 of the hearings, page 66). The photograph of CE 849 printed by the Commission (volume 17, page 840) is somewhat inconsistant with this description. XXXX it shows three fragments of similar size plus an addition,XXX although extremely small one at about 8 o'clock (see enclosed sketch--will be sending a sketch along with this-HR). I do not know the origin of this additional minute fleck.

However, in the slide XXXXX including CE 849 provided to me by the Archives, only 2 fragments are shown in addition to this tiny fleck(see sketch). The letter from Mr. Eckhoff which accompanied the slides did not explain this anomaly. I would therefore like to know a)why the third fragment from CE 840 was not included in my picture, b) if that fragment is still in the possession of the Archives or its present whereabouts, and c) why a fourth fragment in the form of a tiny fleck appears in an exhibit which proports to show three fragments.

(2) CE 843 allegedly consists of 2 metallic fragments removed from President Kennedy's head during the autopsy. Commander Humes testified that these two fragments measured 7 by 2mm and 3 by 1mm respectively (volume 2, page 354). When introduced into evidence before the Commission, CE 843 was described by Agent Frazier as consisting of 2 fragments (volume 5, page 73). If you will consult the picture of CE 843 printed by the Commission (volume 17, page 841), you will see that it actually shows 3 pieces of metal, one XXXXX appearing as a minute dot (see sketch).

The slide which includes CE 843 also portrays a metric scale by which the exhibits may be measured. While the

disposition of the fragments in this photo appears consistant with those depicted in the Commission's photo, there is a definate inconsistancy with the sworn descriptions of the fragments. By the scale in my picture, I can judge that the two measurable fragments are 3 by 1mm and 4 by 3mm in size respectively. No fragment depicted in my picture has a dimention of 7mm as described by Commander Humes. I would like to know a) why three fragments appear in an exhibit which is sworn to consist of 2 fragments, and b) why one of those fragments is smaller (by about 3mm) than described in the hearings.

(3) CE 857 consists of bullet fragments from an experiment in which a skull was ~~M~~ fired upon in an effort to duplicate President ~~A~~ennedy's head wounds; it consists of 2 large ~~f~~ragments and several minute ones. These several minute fragments are also depicted in CE 859. I had requested in my original order for the slides that the tiny partiwles from CE 857 be included in one of the pictures.

By letter of May 19, 1970, Mr. Eckhoff informed me that "We do not have the small bullet fragments shown in Commission Exhibits 859 and 857...The fragments in CE 859 are therefore not included in slide 'D'."

I am at a loss to understand how the Archives couldnot have these fragments. When CE 857 was described before the Commission by Dr. Oliver (who conducted the tests), it was said to contain these small fragments. In Dr. Oliver's own words, "...they are supposed to be all there." (see volume 5, page 88).

Please explain to me why the Archives does not have the small fragments depicted in CE 857, ~~WHHH~~ which <u>was</u> introduced into the Commission's evidence.

I believe it is the duty of the Archives to insure the integrity of these vital pieces of evidence. In connection with the above mentioned, I am prompted to ask these ~~MMMM~~ additional questions.

(4) ~~Has~~ any of the Commission's ballistics evidence been inadvertantly damaged or mutilated since it came into possession of the National Archives? This includes not only loss of substance (as in the case ~~of~~ CE 399's base) but also change of form or shape, no matter how minute or seemingly insignificant. If any such changes have transpired, I would like to know under which circumstances they did occur.

(5) Has any of the ballistics evidence aver been mounted in a pliable substance (such as clay) for the purpose of being photographed or examined since it came into possession of the Archives? If so, please inform me of the "mounting" substance, the particular exhibits and portions thereof which were contacted by this substance, and the residues, if any, which remained on the exhibit.

I would truly appreaciate your assistance in these matters, ~~which before should be brought to your attention.~~

Sincerely,